

New York Tribune.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1913.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation; Ogden M. Reid, President; Condé Hamlin, Secretary; James M. Barrett, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$.75 Daily only, 6 months \$3.00
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$1.50 Daily only, 1 year \$6.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$3.00 Sunday only, 6 months \$1.25
Daily only, 1 month .50 Sunday only, 1 year 2.50

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50 Daily only, 6 months \$6.00
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$3.00 Daily only, 1 year \$12.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$6.00 Sunday only, 6 months \$2.50
Daily only, 1 month 1.00 Sunday only, 1 year 5.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

The Tribune uses its best endeavors to insure the trustworthiness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of all advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

Danger to the City from Political Bushwhackers.

No campaign ever revealed the dangers in which good municipal government here stands more vividly than the one which has just ended. Several times the efforts of the city to escape from its despoilers seemed certain to be defeated by the treachery and selfishness of petty political cliques and their leaders, and success was only won in the end through a combination of fortunate circumstances and the stupid blundering of the Tammany boss.

The meanest kind of politics deprived the city at the outset of the strongest available candidate for the Mayoralty. The Gaynor candidacy threatened division of the forces opposed to Tammany Hall. The characteristic treachery of Hearst imperilled the prospects of an anti-Tammany Board of Estimate and Apportionment. As it was, only the overwhelming sweep of the revolt against Murphy prevented Hearst from delivering an important part of the city government over to the boss. He appears to have succeeded in causing the election of one of Murphy's candidates for justice of the Supreme Court—after being himself a bitter critic of the system under which judges go "hat in hand to Murphy."

And the danger of the city's being betrayed has been greatly increased by the class of leaders which the Progressive party has brought forward. We say nothing against the honest men in that party who sincerely desire development along progressive lines. But they have let their party fall into hands as dangerous to municipal welfare as those of Hearst himself.

A spoiled child of politics like Bird has all the capacity for mischief of an unprincipled marplot like Hearst, first operating on one side and then on another in the anti-Tammany war, like a hired mercenary, as his interests seem to dictate.

The city needs protection from the Birds and the Hearsts. With the breakdown of the great national parties in municipal affairs such political bushwhackers have tended to multiply until the American two-party system has ceased to exist in municipal elections and a condition like that in foreign parliaments has grown up, where a fusion has to be created in order to give any one party the majority.

The ignoring of national party lines in city elections was desirable. The Tribune has itself preached the need of it often in the past. But while it has contributed much toward cleaner and more businesslike city administration, it has also brought evils in its train through creating an opportunity for the Hearsts and the Birds to surround themselves with a following, hold a seeming balance of power and demand their price for protecting the city from thieves.

Sooner or later laws will have to be passed to meet the situation created by these ignoble petty chieftains. Had the opposition to Tammany split into fragments this year, as it more than once threatened to do, the demand for such measures would have been irresistible. But though the danger was averted, it exists for the future. There will always be Hearsts. There will probably be more Birds. Some other cities deal with their kind by holding a primary, in which all but the two candidates having the highest number of supporters are eliminated from the Mayoralty race, and the election is narrowed down to these two. Such a primary here would insure a straightout Tammany-anti-Tammany fight at each city election.

"The Isles of Greece."

Our cable dispatches indicate that a crisis has been reached in the Turco-Greek dispute over the eastern Aegean islands and other matters which may precipitate a renewal of war. Concerning the conflicting claims over the islands, it may be said that on sentimental grounds Greece is right and on geographical grounds Turkey is right.

There can be no question that Mitylene and Chios and Samos and Rhodes and others were long ago "Isles of Greece" and are, indeed, to-day largely Greek in population and sympathies. But neither can there be any question that their proximity to the shore of Asia Minor makes them geographical appendages to the Turkish mainland, so that to give Chios, for example, to Greece would be about as much of an impairment of Turkey in Asia as though Smyrna itself were thus ceded. And, in fact, some of the mainland cities were and are as much Greek colonies as the islands. As for Tenedos, Imbros and Lemnos, they so completely command the entrance to the Dardanelles that they surely belong to the power which owns that strait.

All of which is a reminder that the Ottoman Turks were as much invaders and aliens in Asia Minor as in Thrace, and that in expelling their power from the latter province the question of their final disposition has not been settled, but has merely been postponed and pushed further to the East. There yet remains an extensive *Gracia Ir-*

redenta beyond the Aegean Sea; of which the current threats of Greece are an apt reminder.

Murphy Must Walk the Plank.

Lest there be any mistake about it, "the Chief" has made a solemn announcement that he will not resign. It makes no difference to him that his ticket was defeated. Tammany Hall still stands, and the Tiger has an accumulation of fat which may carry it through four lean years. And he is still "the Chief." He gave back Brady's \$25,000—maybe—but obviously that's no reason why he should give up a perfectly good boss-ship, with all its privileges and perquisites.

Murphy's is the philosophy of the "good loser," who is able and willing to bide his time until circumstances are more favorable to him. He takes with a cynical grin all the war pronouncements which have been nailed on his door, confident that they are things of the moment, bred of election night excitement and the exhilaration of victory. It is the strength of the boss that too often the defeat of his ticket ends the public's concern with him and gives him an opportunity to "come back." Murphy will never "resign." If this city gets rid of him it will be when decent Democrats make him walk the plank. It is to be hoped very fervently that his cynical indifference to the present indignation against him may not prove justified.

One Grain of Comfort.

While Murphy of Tammany cannot obtain any comfort out of the election results for himself, he may be able to extract just one grain from the wreck on account of his "section boss for Brooklyn," chubby John H. McCooey. Thanks to a Progressive endorsement, Surrogate Ketcham was re-elected in Kings County. Mr. Ketcham is the \$10,000 a year official who provides McCooey with a \$9,000 a year job as clerk, much to the dissatisfaction of Brooklyn lawyers. And Mr. Ketcham says McCooey is "efficient" and will not be removed in deference to any public criticism.

Thus McCooey, having saved his job, rejoices, and it is to be hoped that Murphy will take some slight joy in the joy of his colleague. The city takes joy in the fact that, having defeated McCooey's candidate for Controller, the "section boss" will not be able to shift his operations from the limited field of Kings County to the wider opportunities afforded by a job in the Controller's office.

The President's Own State.

The decisive victory of Mr. Fielder in New Jersey is easily explained, on three grounds. One is that Jersey men were proud to have a man from their state in the Presidency and were therefore inclined to support his administration at the polls and to elect his chosen candidate.

Another is that many Progressives, especially the partisans of Mr. Record in Hudson County, were more intent upon defeating the Republican candidate than upon electing their own, and therefore voted for Mr. Fielder as the surest way to defeat Mr. Stokes. A vote for Mr. Colby would have been only a half vote against Mr. Stokes, while one for Mr. Fielder was a whole one.

The third is that in New Jersey the Democratic party, under Mr. Wilson and his successor, has been a party of progress and enlightenment. It has taken up some of the reforms which were proposed and begun by the last two Republican administrations, and with the cordial aid of the Republicans in the Legislature has advanced them toward completion.

In these circumstances a Democratic victory, though by a greatly decreased margin, was not surprising.

The Grim Farce at Kieff.

It is refreshing to have Russians of real light and leading, such as Professor Kokovtsov, of the University of St. Petersburg, express their scornful denunciation of the monstrous proceedings at Kieff, where a jury of sodden moujiks is being regaled with abstruse discussions of the most cryptic passages of the Kabala.

But what a spectacle the Russian government presents to the world in continuing to countenance and promote the grim farce! A prosecution of alleged werewolves would be intelligent and respectable in comparison. If the case involved nothing more than the trial of a man on the fantastic charge of ritual murder it would still be a disgrace.

When, however, it is considered that the real purpose of the insane fabrication is to inflame the passions of the mob and to incite the transformation of Kieff into another Kishineff, the grim farce becomes a scandal upon humanity.

What Reason for a Mandate to Mexico?

A United States mandate to Mexico requiring the elimination of General Huerta and his retainers would obviously be a very serious matter. It would have either to be obeyed or to be refused. If the former, an immense responsibility would be thrown upon this country, he who gives orders being responsible for their effects. But if it should be refused, what then? Either we should have to accept a humiliating rebuff, or we should have to enforce our will at the cost of armed intervention. It is pertinent and prudent to ask what justifying reason we should have for such a course.

We had, obviously, a right to decline to recognize General Huerta as President; a fundamental right of every nation. Moreover, it was our moral duty to exercise that right, at least for a time sufficiently long to indicate our detestation of murder as a political method. We have the right, also, to persist in that refusal of recognition, and to notify Mexico and the world of our purpose thus to persist, until Mexico secures a constitutional Executive free from the taint of murder. But all that does not imply the right to dictate who shall or shall not be the head of the Mexican state.

We had and have, moreover, the indisputable and inalienable right to demand protection and safety for American citizens in Mexico. But neither does that imply the right of censorship over Mexican politics. A usurper who gave our countrymen adequate protection would be *de facto* more acceptable to us than a lawful ruler who did not give it. It would have been reasonable for us at the outset to demand protection for all Americans in Mexico. But to neglect doing so, to warn all Americans to leave Mexico, and then, when nine-tenths of them had got out, to make a strenuous demand for the protection of the lingering remnant would not be convincingly logical.

We may warn Mexico of the consequences of her retention of General Huerta, in our refusal to resume ordinary diplomatic relations. We may withhold belligerent rights from both parties to that civil feud, seeing that we diplomatically recognize neither, or we may grant those rights to both on equal terms. But we should have to search for

a convincing reason for military intervention in the domestic affairs of Mexico against the right of the Mexicans to choose or to tolerate any one who pleases them, even a murderer or usurper, as their chief of state.

Now to "make good."

New Yorkers can say with real sincerity to-day that they are citizens of no mean city.

Murphy says that he will not resign from Tammany. Will Tammany resign from Murphy?

"I'm a pretty good Indian myself," Mr. Sulzer remarked recently. Count the scalps.

There will be a peculiar zest in Gotham's Thanksgiving year.

Colombia's clinging to Panama is more sentimental than practical.

Has anybody heard from Julius?

THE TALK OF THE DAY.

Golfers will appreciate this little story of the game, told by President Wilson: A proud owner of a links had General Grant as his guest so that he might show the great warrior how the game was played. Placing the ball in the tee, he aimed carefully and swung his drives, but missed the ball. Wiping the perspiration from his brow he tried again and missed. Undaunted, but somewhat nervous, he tried once more, only to miss for the third time. The general had been a careful observer all the time, and before his host could make another attempt he said, without a smile: "There's no doubt about it; that is fine exercise. But what is the little ball for?"

"This railroad seems to be really trying to remedy matters."

"Yes; in that last accident an official of the road was injured."—Pittsburgh Post.

TO MISS GODIVA.

Poiret declares American women are so "well constructed" that they should "be daring" in their costumes.—News Item.

Oh, lady heed not Poiret's voice,

Declaring,

If you would make mankind rejoice,

Be daring!

No doubt he's right—you are so well

Constructed;

All other women you'd excel

Inducted

Into the garments most extreme—

But spare us!

You are already such a dream

You scare us!

Alas! should you much further go

Unshipping,

The rest of womankind, although

Outstripping,

You'd miss the mark, I must surmise,

Completely,

For man would have to shield his eyes

Discreetly!

G. B. M.

"Does anybody call the junk that fellow writes 'poetry'?"

"Why not? It has been called everything else that's unpopular."—Washington Star.

Speaking of the late Philip Mohr, who died at the age of eighty-three a few days ago, a New York druggist said: "The old German confectioner certainly gave us ice cream soda and was the first to discover the commercial value of that cool creation, but years before he offered the first ice cream soda for sale a child had the same idea. It was in Troy, in the days when children went to 'ice cream parlors' and with an outlay of five cents secured a 'dish of cream with two spoons.' Two tots with a dish of cream and an extra five-cent piece went to a store near the 'parlor,' laid down the coin and asked for soda water. With the aid of an extra glass it was divided and the ice cream was added. There were no spoons, but the children needed none. The druggist smiled, and years later when ice cream soda became a feature of his business he recalled the incident and what he might have done in the way of business if he had taken the hint."

"They say he's a gifted speaker."

"Gifted? I should say he is. Why he can talk an hour on a minute's notice."—Detroit Free Press.

THERE'S GOING TO BE ANOTHER WAR.



THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

FROM A FRANK PROGRESSIVE.

Oust Mr. Barnes, He Urges, and His Party Will Return to the Fold.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The voters of New York City have put Murphy on the toboggan by defeating his messenger-boy ticket here. They made a good beginning, too, toward taking the state away from him by electing a Republican Assembly. But a good many people are likely to think, as I do, that unless the Republican party experiences a drastic change of heart and dumps out State Chairman Barnes as we expect to see decent Democrats dump out Murphy this will prove to have been merely a choice of evils.

Some of us looked with hope toward the Progressive party when that organization was formed. It has turned out to be merely a destructive force, its personnel a collection of featherweights who play petty politics of Tammany's brand without Tammany's willingness to get into a real fight. There is no good in it.

Hundreds of so-called Progressives would be glad to go back as members of a Republican party without Barnes leadership. They'll never do it, though, until Barnes is turned out and there is left in the party control no vestige of his fossilized views and pro-corporation bias. C.
New York, Nov. 5, 1913.

AN OUTRAGEOUS PROPOSAL

Cession of Land to Great Britain Is Called Subversive of Independence.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Two days ago an alleged representative of Maryland people offered a resolution in the House directing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with purpose and intent to cede to Great Britain three thousand square miles of United States Pacific Coast territory. This resolution was offered in the House when only fifty members were present. Yesterday this would-be destroyer of the Monroe Doctrine—evidently of many people in this country who are shamelessly subservient to British capitalist interests—talked at length to the House in eager support of his outrageous proposal—not his own, by the way, for he is only one of many servile mouthpieces in this matter.

Last May this same proposition was introduced by a similarly unrepresentative individual from Texas, and he, by some unheard-of hocus-pocus, made it a joint resolution, if you please.

Nothing so fundamentally and everywise opposed to American natural and national rights, including the Monroe Doctrine, has ever come before our Congress as is this proposal to cede United States territory to England. Nothing so outrageously subversive of American independence was ever heretofore proposed in the halls of any legislative body in this country. Nothing so shamefully disgraceful as is this, to those who made it a joint resolution, has ever before been done by any of our national representatives. And as for the smug, impudent assurance that emanates from British plutocrats—your Cowdrays, Aberconways, Rothmans and the like—impudence that reaches clear through our own Congress and sets to direct the President of the United States to negotiate to give up three thousand square miles of our territory to the one nation on the globe that worships us financially—this impudence will presently meet its long deserved rebuke; no doubt about it.

ALFRED LAURENS BRENNAN.
New York, Nov. 1, 1913.

CALLING MR. SULZER NAMES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Kindly correct the statement in your issue of to-day that I termed the ex-Governor as "the rat Sulzer." This expression was not used by me, but by the women and children in the crowd that jeered and howled on last Saturday night at the man who went out of his way to

storm our neighborhood in favor of himself and fusion.

JAMES B. CURRY, Pastor.
Church of St. James, New York, Nov. 4, 1913.

SUFFRAGE AND BRAUN

If All Husbands Were Sturdy Enough All Would Be Peace, Says a Reader.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: "Is your mother a suffragette?" "You bet she ain't. Me father's a prize-fighter!"

What a world of significance in this brief colloquy! Although printed in a daily paper as a "joke" on female suffrage, it is of serious import, disclosing as it does the true genesis of this political heresy.

It may be assumed that the husband of the original suffragette was not a prize-fighter, certainly not a fighter for supremacy in his own home. A man's home is recognized in law as his castle, of which he is lord and master, and wherein he is supposed to reign supreme over all inmates. Are all homes conducted on this hypothesis? Is the nominal head of the house its actual ruler, or in some cases is the authority that of right belongs to husbands and should be maintained by them meekly surrendered to their stronger minded wives or ruthlessly usurped by these aggressive women?

Humiliating though it be to normal manhood, it must be admitted that there are some spineless, egotistic men, of negligible mentality, who are heedless or incapable of exercising this marital authority, and it is hardly to be wondered at that the wives of these invertebrates should overstep the limitations of their sex. If there were fewer such husbands would there be so many suffragettes? Of course, married women and erstwhile wives constitute the mass and mainstay of this suffrage movement. The maiden cohorts of the cause need not be considered, as they would likely change their views upon marriage to sensible men. They are merely the chorus girls of what might be regarded as an exaggerated burlesque were it not for the tragic performances of some of the leading actors.

A NORMAL MAN.
New York, Nov. 3, 1913.

THE POLICE AS MARKSMEN

A Record of the Cattle Stampede Receives a Comment.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One hates to arouse the echoes of the past and awaken the oblivion which has been re-established regarding the erstwhile downtrodden blue "coterie," but the recent exhibition of marksmanship coincident with the escape from death or injury of seven out of eight strolling bull-locks and the killing of a man and injury of others is far from creditable to the discipline of the department.

If the shot which deprived an innocent bystander of his eye and life simultaneously had been directed to the "bull's eye" for which it was presumably intended, and if several oxen had been brought low and the several persons who were killed or mutilated spared, there would be room for unstinted praise and thanks-giving for so noble and practiced a body of guardians of the peace and cattle. But very faint praise is due now for the unerring aim of the "finest." Will the municipality recompense the dead man's family?

New York, Nov. 5, 1913.

SMOKING IN THE SUBWAY.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A news item in to-day's Tribune states that an attempt is being made to permit smoking in the subway. You know that that would be a nuisance, even if smoking cars are provided. I hope that you will use your influence to maintain decency in this case, as you have in many others. The "stinkpots" must be kept out of the subway.

H. A. S.
New York, Oct. 23, 1913.

"SCUTTLE AND DRIFT"

That Policy Toward Mexico Must End, a Reader Urges.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: To any one acquainted with Mexico and its people the present attitude of the Washington administration cannot be viewed with anything short of the utmost amazement. The facts are as follows: The population of Mexico is about fourteen millions, accurate computation being, of course, impossible. Of this number something over two millions are of the white race, mostly of Spanish descent, many of them as highly educated and cultivated as can anywhere be found, together with a sprinkling of white foreigners, numbering, perhaps, until President Wilson's recent warning, fifty thousand. The remaining eleven or twelve millions are nearly equally divided between the pure blooded Indians, the descendants of the aborigines whom Cortez found there, and the mestizos, or people of mixed blood, the latter somewhat outnumbering the former. As the great mass of the people are therefore simply ignorant and illiterate peons, living from hand to mouth on starvation wages, without ownership in the land, it would seem hardly necessary to state that anything in the nature of an intelligent public opinion in any way sufficient to create, or even suggest, a self-governing people is practically unknown. In other words, political conditions in Mexico can be likened to what they would be in our own country if about four-fifths of our population consisted of a combination of North American Indians and halfbreeds ruthlessly ruled from New York City, so far as great distances would permit, by a military Tammany Hall, with the "chief" not only in command of our federal army, but also in a position, as shown lately, through sheer decree, to increase that army to any extent that his necessities might require and his enforced exchequer pay for.

When, therefore, we now hear any of our fellow citizens enunciating in rounded periods certain abstract principles of liberty, including the commonplaces of "consent of the governed" and "free and fair elections" and other similar phrases, a feeling of combined sadness and apprehension is engendered by the thought that people in positions of overwhelming responsibility and power, however high minded and pure their motives, should be so deceived as to actual conditions as to permit their governmental acts to be controlled by such unstatesmanlike sentimentality.

As the result has shown, the policy assumed by the Washington Cabinet has been to place us in a false position from the very beginning, and, humiliating as the confession of failure must necessarily be, it is respectfully submitted that the only thing for our government now to do, though even at the eleventh hour, is to recognize that facts are stern and awkward things that must be boldly met, and that the proper solution of the present difficulty is to recognize Huerta, or his nominee, as the de facto President of Mexico, upon whom will rest the international responsibility for bringing order out of chaos, and therefore entitled to the moral support of every nation having citizens, subjects or material interests at stake in his distracted country.

Should conditions in Mexico not then improve and an ultimate necessity for our intervention arise, I think it may be safely stated that a vast majority of the limited number of people in the United States at all familiar with Mexican conditions would be of the very decided opinion that the best had been done and that no different course of action could have prevented intervention.

But whatever our future relations with Mexico are to be, the American people should sternly recognize that the scuttle and drift policy has run its course and that something definite must now be done.

SAMUEL L. PARRISH.
New York, Nov. 2, 1913.